UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,402	06/30/2000	Ernie F. Brickell	10559-225001	9862

20985 7590 10/27/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
12390 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081

EXAMINER	
GREENE, DANIEL L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3621	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/608,402	BRICKELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel L. Greene	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 September 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Amendment B, filed 8/6/03, with respect to claims 1, 13,23, 30, 42, and 48, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Finale Rejection of 5/16/03 has been withdrawn.

2. The Applicant states that the claims have been amended to indicate that a digital credential is a digital mechanism associated with a user's identity. Based upon the criteria presented in the Specifications, the definition of a digital credential is the same as a digital signature of a user. Both digital units require prior authentication and encryption techniques that render the units unique to the user. The use of the user's digital signature will be presented in a proceeding section of this Office Action.

3. The Applicant describes a method in claims 1, 13, and 23 that duplicate the standard procedure of conducting business with a credit card. i.e.

a- present card to merchant

b- merchant requests authorization to a central authorization center.

c- authorization center verifies the validity of the card.

d- validation results sent to the merchant.

e- transaction is posted in an activity file.

f- credit card facility provides monthly or upon request usage history.

g- access to the usage history is restricted to the user or their designate.

The previous described credit card method is obvious and well known to a person having ordinary skill in the art. The use of a digital signature limits the use to a digital environment and therefore can render the application unique.

The Examiner has presented new art that addresses the additional modifying limitations presented in the Amendment.

The Applicants argument regarding claims 53-56 is that " none of Anderson, Sudia, and Goldsmith describe or suggest receiving an activity report that lists transaction information, a digital credential, and a transaction result from a credential verification service to which transaction information is communicated and from which a verification result is received." Anderson does not expressly show receiving an activity report that lists transaction information, a digital credential, and a transaction result from a credential verification service to which transaction information is communicated and from which a verification result is received. However, Goldsmith does show a financial institution that provides transaction information to a user. The kind of data that is included in an activity report is basically nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. The receiving of an activity report would be performed the same regardless of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Also, Goldsmith shows in Fig. 3, block 42, " GENERATE A MESSAGE INCLUDING ACCOUNT ID, INFORMATION AND A DESCRIPTION OF ACCOOUNT ACTIVITY." As stated, the terms "INFORMATION' and

" DESCRIPTION OF ACCOUNT ACTIVITY" teaches to the limitations presented in claims 53-56. A reference is to be considered not only for what it expressly states, but also for what it would reasonably have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re DeLisle, 160 USPQ 806 (CCPA 1969)*

Also, one cannot show non-obviousness by attacking the references individually where the rejection is based on a combination of references. *In re Young, 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to collect for a customer any type of data and provide a report to the customers having any type of content because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

The reference cited was Fig. 26, which encompasses the descriptive material in Columns 39-40. Anderson provides the motivation to Goldsmith at Col. 40, lines 8-10. " Signatures, authentication, data manipulations, storage and retrieval, and other functions are accomplished in a manner similar to that used for the electronic check. Anderson further teaches about the transaction method utilizing digital links between payer and payer's bank. It is well known to the general public that banks provide transaction reports on a periodic basis (monthly statements) and on request reports and status after the requester has been authenticated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8, 10,12-18,20,22-37,39,41,45,47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. US 6,021,202 [Anderson 202], and in further view of Vance et al.- U.S. 6,442,526 [Vance' 526].

As per claims 1,13,23,32.

Anderson' 202 teaches:

receiving a request to verify a use of a digital credential by a user of a digital credential, the digital credential being a digital security mechanism associated with user's identity, the use occurring at a first of a plurality of different locations where the digital credential can be used, verifying the use of the digital certificate in response to receipt of the request to verify, and sending the result of the verification to the first service. Col. 23-24, lines 1-67. Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for the storing a result of the verification in an activity log in a central service that communicates with each of said plurality of different services; and allowing specified users to access said result. However, Anderson [202] does disclose, "... send bank statements ... which reflects events of the transaction..." Col. 6, lines 5-58.

Vance '526 teaches that it is known in the art to provide storing the result of the verification in an activity log in a central location that communicates with each of said plurality of different locations; and allowing specified users to access said result. Col. 12,13,14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the detail in Anderson '202 about storing a result of the verification in an activity log in a central location that communicates with each of said plurality of different locations; and allowing specified users to access said result as taught by Vance '526, in order to clarify the generation and use of bank/transaction statements.

As per claims 2,14,24,31.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for storing transaction information in the activity log. However, Anderson [202] does disclose, "... send bank statements ... which reflects events of the transaction..." Col. 6, lines 5-58. Vance '526 teaches storing transaction information in the activity log. Col. 12,13,14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the results of a transaction so that at a later time a bank/transaction statement could be generated.

As per claims 3,15,25,28,33,47

Anderson [202] further discloses:

wherein the transaction information includes at least one of a message that was signed using a digital signature key of the digital credential, a value of a transaction, an online service, an internet protocol (IP) address, a date of the transaction and a time of the transaction. Col. 25, lines 64-67, Col. 26, lines 1-35.

As per claim 4,16.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for generating an activity report from the activity log, wherein the activity report lists the stored results. However, Anderson [202] does disclose, "... send bank statements ... which reflects events of the transaction..." Col. 6, lines 5-58. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the results of a transaction so that at a later time an activity report from the activity log [a bank statement] could be generated.

As per claims 5,17,34.

Anderson [202] further discloses:

associating a name to a digital signature key of the digital credential, wherein the activity report lists the name of the digital signature key. Fig. 6, Col. 25, lines 64-67, Col. 26, lines 1-35.

As per claim 6,35.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for wherein generating the activity report for the owner includes generating the activity report upon request by an owner of the digital credential. However, Anderson [202] does disclose, "... provide statements or reports to the payer and the payee..." Col. 30, lines 19-29. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate an activity report based upon the request by an owner (payee/payer) of the digital credential.

As per claim 7,36.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein generating the activity report includes generating the activity report each time the digital credential is verified. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the teachings of Anderson [202], to provide the step of wherein generating the activity report includes generating the activity report each time the digital credential is verified. Since the applicant has not disclosed that generating the activity report includes generating the activity report each time the digital credential is verified solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Anderson [202] will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any method,

means, or product to generate an activity report that includes generating the activity report each time the digital credential is verified.

As per claim 8,37.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of generating a report periodically. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the teachings of Anderson [202], to provide the step of generating a report periodically. Since the applicant has not disclosed that generating a report periodically solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Anderson [202] will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any method, means, or product to generating a report periodically.

As per claims 10,20,39.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for wherein generating the activity report includes listing activity for a plurality of digital signature keys associated with the owner. However, Anderson [202] does disclose, "... provide statements or reports to the payer and the payee..." Col. 30, lines 19-29.

Vance '526 teaches that it is known in the art to generate an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view

only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates. Col. 12,13,14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the detail in Anderson '202 about generating an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates as taught by Vance '526, in order to maintain the integrity of the tracking/reporting system.

As per claims 12,22,41.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for generating an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates. However, Anderson [202] does disclose, "... provide statements or reports to the payer and the payee..." Col. 30, lines 19-29.

Vance '526 teaches that it is known in the art to generate an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates. Col. 12,13,14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the detail in Anderson '202 about generating an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates as taught by Vance '526, in order to maintain the integrity of the tracking/reporting system.

As per claim 18.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein the computer-executable instructions cause the computer to generate the activity report upon receiving a request by an owner of the digital credential, and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the teachings of Anderson [202], to provide the step of generating the activity report upon receiving a request by an owner of the digital credential, periodically, or when the digital credential is verified.

Vance '526 teaches that it is known in the art to generate an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view

only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates. Col. 12,13,14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the detail in Anderson '202 about generating an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates as taught by Vance '526, in order to maintain the integrity of the tracking/reporting system.

As per claim 26.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for comprising an owner database to store information of an owner of the digital credential and owner-approved delegates and wherein said communication element allows said owner to view all reports, but allows each said delegate to view only their own report, and not reports for other delegates. However, Anderson [202] does disclose , "... memory may contain certification information..." Col. 12, lines 57-65.

Vance '526 teaches that it is known in the art to have an owner database to store information of an owner of the digital credential and owner-approved delegates and wherein said communication element allows said owner to view all reports, but allows each said delegate to view only their own report, and not reports for other delegates. Col. 12,13,14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the detail in Anderson '202 about generating an activity report which includes activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates as taught by Vance '526, in order to maintain the integrity of the tracking/reporting system.

As per claim 27.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for a first data field to store a result from an verification of a digital credential by a user of a digital credential at any of a plurality of different services where the digital credential can be used. However, Anderson [202] does disclose , "... send bank statements ... which reflects events of the transaction..." Col. 6, lines 5-58. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store a result from a verification of a digital credential by a user of a digital credential at any of a plurality of different services where the digital credential can be used allowing specified user's to access said results so that at a later time [a bank statement] could be generated.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for a plurality of data fields to store transaction information relating to each verification result in a central service that communicates with each of said plurality of different services; and a data access structure, allowing specified user's to access said results. Vance '526 teaches

that it is known in the art to provide a plurality of data fields to store transaction information relating to each verification result in a central service that communicates with each of said plurality of different services; and a data access structure, allowing specified user's to access said results. Col. 12,13,14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the detail in Vance '526 about a plurality of data fields to store transaction information relating to each verification result in a central service that communicates with each of said plurality of different services; and a data access structure, allowing specified user's to access said results as taught by Vance '526, in order to maintain the integrity of the tracking/reporting system.

As per claim 29.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for the data structures further include a plurality of data fields to store owner and delegate information. However, Anderson [202] does disclose , "... memory may contain certification information..." Col. 12, lines 57-65. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have memory that could hold the data structures that include a plurality of data fields to store owner and delegate information to provide a complete list of who is authorized to use the certificate.

As per claim 30:

Anderson '202 discloses the claimed invention of generating transaction reports. Anderson '202 does not specifically disclose about corporate/multi user accounts. Vance '526 teaches, Fig. 16A-16M, that it is known in the art to provide for :

receiving use information describing a first use of a digital credential by an owner of a digital credential, at any of a plurality of different services where the digital credential can be used, the digital credential being a digital security mechanism associated with a user's identity; receiving use information describing a second use of the digital credential by a delegate of the owner of the digital credential, at any of the plurality of different services where the digital credential can be used;

storing the use information in an activity log.

generating an activity report for the delegate based on the activity log;

generating an activity report for the owner based on the activity log,

allowing said owner to view all reports;

allowing said delegate to view only the activity report for the delegate, and not the activity report for the owner or activity reports for other delegates.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the method and system for processing electronic documents of Anderson '202 with the corporate planning and management system of Vance '526, in order to illustrate different techniques in the use of the methods and systems taught by Anderson' 202.

As per claim 45.

Goldsmith' 990 further discloses ;

wherein the use information includes transaction information. Col. 8, lines 1-27

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for allowing comprises allowing said owner to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates. However, Anderson [202] does disclose , "... provide statements or reports to the payer and the payee..." Col. 30, lines 19-29.

Vance '526 teaches that it is known in the art to wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates. Col. 12,13,14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in Anderson '202 about generating activity reports of the delegates of the user and wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said delegate to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates as taught by Vance '526, in order to maintain the integrity of the tracking/reporting system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldsmith US 6,064,990 [Goldsmith' 990], and in further view of Vance '526.

As per claim 48.

Goldsmith' 990 discloses;

receiving transaction requests from a plurality of delegate users who are delegated from an owner, Col. 2, lines 60-67

wherein the transaction requests include digital credentials for the users, the digital credentials being digital security mechanisms associated with (the) user's identities.; Col. 2, lines 55-60

processing the transaction requests; Col. 2, lines 60-67

communicating transaction information to a central service, Col. 2, lines 60-67

wherein the transaction information includes the digital credentials of the delegate, the transaction information communicated to create, for the plurality of the delegate users, activity reports at the central service. Col. 2, lines 50-55.

Goldsmith '990 discloses the claimed invention except for said owner is allowed to view (all reports), while each delegate is allowed to view only their own activity report,

and not allowed to view reports for other delegates.

Vance '526 teaches that it is known in the art to provide a wherein said allowing comprises allowing said user to view all reports, but allowing each said to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the transaction request involving digital credentials of Goldsmith '990 with the ability of a user (corporation) to view all reports, but allowing each said to view only their own activity report, and not allowing each said delegate to view reports for other delegates, in order to maintain control and security of corporation expenditures.

As per claim 49.

Goldsmith further discloses;

wherein processing the transaction requests includes communicating the digital credentials to the central service for verification. Fig. 1, **10**

Claims 9,19,38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson [202], and further in view of Yacobi US 5,878,138 -Yacobi [138]

As per claims 9,19,38.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for the analyzing the activity log to detect misuse of the digital credential. However, Anderson [202] does

disclose "Solutions to the problem of potential fraudulent usage ...must be built into the system at each stage..." Col. 36, lines 32-35. Yacobi [138] teaches that it is known to analyze the activity log to detect misuse of the digital credential. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to analyze the activity log to detect misuse of the digital credential as taught by Yacobi [138], since Yacobi [138] states at Col. 4, lines 8-9 that such a modification would provide that once fraud is detected, further perpetuation is prevented.

Claims 11,21,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson [202] , and further in view of Sudia US 5,659,616 Sudia [616]

As per claims 11,21,40.

Anderson [202] discloses the claimed invention except for the authorizing one or more delegates to use a delegated digital credential to act on behalf of the owner of the digital credential for specified functions, wherein verifying the use of the digital credential includes determining whether the delegated digital credential was authorized for the specific use.

Sudia [616] teaches that it is known to authorize one or more delegates to use a delegated digital credential to act on behalf of the owner of the digital credential for specified functions, wherein verifying the use of the digital credential includes determining whether the delegated digital credential was authorized for the specific use.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to authorize one or more delegates to use a delegated digital credential to act on behalf of the owner of the digital credential for specified functions, wherein verifying the use of the digital credential includes determining whether the delegated digital credential was authorized for the specific use as taught by Sudia [616], since Sudia [616] states at Col. 14, lines 61-67, Col. 15, lines 1-12, that such a modification would provide flexibility in the use of the digital signature.

Claims 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldsmith US 6,064,990 [Goldsmith' 990].

As per claim 42.

Goldsmith '990 discloses;

storing use information for a user; Col. 1, lines 53-55

processing the use information; Col. 1, lines 55-57

generating an alert. Col. 1, lines 57-64.

Goldsmith '990 discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of storing use information for a digital credential of a plurality of delegates who are delegated to use said digital credential by an owner, the digital credential being a digital security mechanism associated with the user's identity and processing the use information for each of said plurality of delegates to detect misuse. However, Goldsmith' 990 is providing usage information on the activity of data associated with the

user. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to modify the teachings of Goldsmith '990, to provide the step of storing use information for a digital certificate or any other type of data associated with the user. Since the applicant has not disclosed that a digital certificate uniquely distinguishes itself from any other type of data which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Goldsmith' 990 will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant regardless of what the data is being used for or named.

Goldsmith '990 discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of processing the use information to detect misuse. However, Goldsmith' 990 does process the information if the authentication is breached or for any unauthorized activity. Col. 2, lines 5-10. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to modify the teachings of Goldsmith '990, to call breaching the authentication protocol or unauthorized activity as a misuse of an account. Since the applicant has not disclosed that term "misuse" distinguishes itself from any other type breaching or unauthorized activity which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Goldsmith' 990 will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant regardless of what the breaching or unauthorized activity is called.

Goldsmith '990 discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of generating an alert to the owner based on the detection of misuse. However, Goldsmith' 990 does immediately notify a user of account activity. Col. 2, lines 5-10.

Goldsmith' 990 does include notification of any user-designated misuse of their account. Since the applicant has not disclosed that generating an alert when misuse is detected distinguishes itself from any other type notification activity which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Goldsmith' 990 will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant and include misuse information in the user notification.

As per claim 43.

Goldsmith' 990 further discloses;

generating an activity report based on the use information. Fig. 3

As per claim 44.

Goldsmith '990 discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein generating an alert includes alerting a credential service provider. However, Goldsmith' 990 does disclose transforming the account activity message into an e-mail message and transmitting the e-mail message to the user provided e-mail address. Col. 6, lines 58-65. The user provided e-mail addresses are only limited by the user's imagination. It would have been an obvious matter of choice to modify the teachings of Goldsmith '990, to include in the user's e-mail a credential service provider. Since the applicant has not disclosed that alerting a credential service provider distinguishes itself from alerting any other type of organization which is unobvious to

one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Goldsmith' 990 will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant regardless of who or what organization is alerted.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldsmith' 990 and further in view of Sudia' 616.

As per claim 46.

Goldsmith' 990 discloses the claimed invention except for that the use information includes verification information for the digital credential. Sudia' 616 teaches that it is known to verify digital credentials. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to verify digital information as taught by Sudia' 616 and issue a report as taught by Goldsmith' 990.

Claims 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldsmith' 990 and further in view of Anderson' 202 and Sudia' 616.

As per claim 50.

Goldsmith' 990 discloses the claimed invention except for the verifying the digital certificate and communicating the result of the verification to the credential service. Anderson' 202 teaches that it is known to verify digital certificates. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

verify digital certificates as taught by Anderson' 202, since Anderson' 202 teaches at Col. 6, lines 40-55 verification of digital certificates.

Goldsmith' 990 and Anderson' 202 disclose the claimed invention except for communicating a result of the verification to the credential service.

Sudia [616] teaches that it is known to verify the digital credential; and communicate the result of the verification to the credential service.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to verify the digital credential; and communicate the result of the verification to the credential service as taught by Sudia [616], since Sudia [616] states at Col. 14, lines 61-67, Col. 15, lines 1-12, that such a modification would provide flexibility in the use of the digital signature.

As per claim 51.

Goldsmith' 990 and Anderson '202 discloses the claimed invention except for receiving a activity report from the central service, wherein the activity report lists the transaction information for each digital credential. However, Anderson [202] does disclose , "... send bank statements ... which reflects events of the transaction..." Col. 6, lines 5-58. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store a result from a verification of a digital credential and a plurality of data fields to store transaction information relating to each verification result so that at a later time [a bank statement] could be generated.

As per claim 52.

Goldsmith' 990 discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the transaction information includes at least one of a message that was signed, a transaction value, an online service, an internet protocol (IP) address, a value of the transaction, a date of the transaction and a the time of the transaction.

Anderson' 202 discloses wherein the transaction information includes at least one of a message that was signed, a transaction value, an online service, an internet protocol (IP) address, a value of the transaction, a date of the transaction and a the time of the transaction. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to wherein the transaction information includes at least one of a message that was signed, a transaction value, an online service, an internet protocol (IP) address, a value of the transaction, a date of the transaction and a the time of the transaction as taught by Anderson' 202, since Anderson' 202 shows in Fig. 6 that transaction information includes at least one of a message that was signed, a transaction value, an online service, an internet protocol (IP) address, a value of the transaction, a date of the transaction and a the time of the transaction

Claim 53-56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson' 202, and further in view of Goldsmith' 990.

As per claim 53.

Anderson' 202 discloses;

receiving a request from a medical professional to access medical information at a remote service , Fig. 26

wherein the request includes a digital credential for the medical professional, the digital credential being a digital security mechanism associated with the medical professional's identity; Fig. 26

communicating transaction information describing the access request and the digital credential to a credential verification service; Fig 26

receiving a verification result from the credential verification service; Fig. 26

providing the medical professional access to the medical information based on the verification result; Fig. 26

Anderson' 202 discloses the claimed invention except for receiving an activity report from the credential verification service and wherein the activity report lists the transaction information, the digital credential and the transaction result. Goldsmith '990 teaches that it is known to receive an activity report from the credential verification service and wherein the activity report lists the transaction information, the digital credential and the transaction result. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive an activity report from the

credential verification service and wherein the activity report list the transaction information, the digital credential and the transaction result as taught by Goldsmith '990.

As per claim 54.

Anderson' 202 further discloses;

wherein the transaction information includes at least an access type, a date of the transaction and a time of the transaction. Fig. 6.

As per claim 55.

Anderson' 202 further discloses;

wherein the digital credential was provided by a credential issuing service and a credential service provider. Fig. 24

As per claim 56.

Anderson' 202 further discloses;

receiving a request to access the activity report from an owner of the digital credential; Col. 31, lines 10-67

providing the owner access to the activity report. Col. 31, lines 10-67

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are

applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 703-306-5539. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

10/22/03

DLG

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600